

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/601,246	07/31/2000	OSAMU WADA	106389 9837		
25944	7590 03/30/2005		EXAMINER		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			OSORIO, RICARDO		
P.O. BOX 199 ALEXANDRI	028 A, VA 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2673		
			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/601,246	WADA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Artonic	

Before the Filling of all Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	RICARDO L OSORIO	2673					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 08 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amend condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The</li> </ol>	a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aban ment, affidavit, or other evidence, v al fee) in compliance with 37 CFR e reply must be filed within one of t	donment of this applic which places the application (3) a Reque	ication in st for Continued				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL BE JECTION See AMPED 700 07(b).							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee							
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		I E below);					
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:		,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
<ul> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.							
12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 1Z30Z00↓ 13. □ Other:							
	Z	ando G	Deis				
			_				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that on page 17, line 24 of the specification applicant discloses of reading a book and that a book is natiurally a still image, and therefore there is support in the specification for "so as to reduce or eliminate color breakup in still images caused by high speed eye movement" Examiner disagrees because the specification is referring to a user reading a book and not to a user watching a displayed image generated at a predetermined frequency to eliminate color breakup. These are two totally different environments. Therefore, there is not enough support for "in still images", as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 14. For all the other arguments in reference to 35 USC 112 1st and 35 USC 102(b), see previous Final Office Action.